

Visual-Linguistic Agent: Towards Collaborative Contextual Object Reasoning

Jingru Yang
Carnegie Mellon University
jingrui@andrew.cmu.edu

Huan Yu
Zhejiang University
22225179@zju.edu.cn

Jingxin Yang
Beijing Institute of Petrochemical Technology
yangjx511@outlook.com

Chentianye Xu
Carnegie Mellon University
chentianye.xu@gmail.com

Biao Yin
TikTok
yinbiao15@outlook.com

Yu Sun
Sealand Technology Inc.
18521326265@163.com

Shengfeng He
Singapore Management University
shengfenghe7@gmail.com




Figure 1. An example from the proposed **Visual-Linguistic-Agent (VLA)** paradigm. Here, the Visual Agent (YOLO) detects objects in an image but misclassifies the moon as an orange. The Linguistic Agent (MLLM) evaluates these detection results and, using its reasoning capabilities, identifies and corrects the error. This example demonstrates the effectiveness of integrating visual detection with linguistic reasoning to enhance the accuracy and contextual reliability of object detection outcomes.

Abstract

Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) excel at descriptive tasks within images but often struggle with precise object localization, a critical element for reliable visual interpretation. In contrast, traditional object detection models provide high localization accuracy but frequently generate detections lacking contextual coherence due to limited modeling of inter-object relationships. To address this fundamental limitation, we introduce the **Visual-Linguistic Agent (VLA)**, a collaborative framework that combines the relational reasoning strengths of MLLMs with the precise localization capabilities of traditional object de-

ectors. In the VLA paradigm, the MLLM serves as a central Linguistic Agent, working collaboratively with specialized Vision Agents for object detection and classification. The Linguistic Agent evaluates and refines detections by reasoning over spatial and contextual relationships among objects, while the classification Vision Agent offers corrective feedback to improve classification accuracy. This collaborative approach enables VLA to significantly enhance both spatial reasoning and object localization, addressing key challenges in multimodal understanding. Extensive evaluations on the COCO dataset demonstrate substantial performance improvements across multiple detection models, highlighting VLA’s potential to set a new benchmark in ac-

curate and contextually coherent object detection.

1. Introduction

Object detection models have achieved remarkable success, particularly on large-scale datasets like COCO [12]. However, most existing object detection networks [2, 6, 27, 28] primarily focus on generating high-quality proposals, employing separate branches to predict the class and bounding box for each proposal. While these models are effective in localizing objects with precision, they often overlook spatial and logical relationships between objects, resulting in detections that may lack contextual coherence, as shown in Figure 1. This gap highlights the need to incorporate spatial and logical relationship modeling to enhance the reasoning and overall accuracy of detection results. Despite its importance, this aspect has received relatively limited attention in the field.

Several studies [14, 25, 29] have attempted to address this limitation by modeling spatial and logical relationships between objects using Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs) [15] or Gated Recurrent Units (GRUs) [3, 32] applied to the visual representations of detected bounding boxes. These approaches primarily improve the bounding box regression branch by explicitly modeling relationships among objects. However, they are often constrained to relationships between local objects, neglecting the broader contextual environment and overall spatial structure among objects. Furthermore, as these methods typically operate independently of the classification branch, they provide limited improvements in the coherence and reasoning of final detection outcomes.

In contrast, multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [4, 10, 11, 13, 21, 31] have demonstrated exceptional capabilities in modeling relationships across modalities, such as in image captioning [17] and visual question answering [1]. MLLMs are proficient at constructing both spatial and logical relationships between objects, offering a more holistic understanding of visual scenes. However, despite their strong reasoning abilities, MLLMs struggle with precise object localization. Our motivation arises from the observation that combining the reasoning strengths of MLLMs with the robust localization capabilities of traditional object detection models can enhance both the accuracy and contextual coherence of object detection results.

In this paper, we propose the **Visual-Linguistic-Agent** (VLA), a collaborative framework that leverages the reasoning and relationship-modeling capabilities of MLLMs to enhance the contextual accuracy of traditional object detection models. In the VLA paradigm, the MLLM, which acts as a Linguistic Agent, collaborates with both an object detection **Vision Agent** and a classification **Vision Agent**.

As illustrated in Figure 1, upon receiving a user request, the MLLM generates an image caption and evaluates detection outputs provided as text prompts from the Vision Agent, subsequently correcting false detections using the classification Vision Agent. This collaborative interaction effectively combines the MLLM’s reasoning capabilities with the object localization strengths of the Vision Agents, resulting in detection outcomes that are more accurate and contextually coherent.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

1. We propose the **Visual-Linguistic-Agent** (VLA), a novel collaborative framework that utilizes the reasoning and relationship-modeling capabilities of MLLMs to enhance the contextual coherence of object detection.
2. Within VLA, the MLLM operates as a Linguistic Agent, collaborating with both object detection and classification Vision Agents to filter out false detections by reasoning over spatial relationships and leveraging the classification agent for corrective feedback. This approach maximizes the MLLM’s reasoning capabilities while strengthening its localization accuracy, resulting in more contextually consistent detection outcomes.
3. Extensive experiments on the COCO dataset demonstrate that VLA achieves up to 3% improvement in $AP_{50:95}$ over state-of-the-art object detection models, underscoring the benefits of integrating linguistic reasoning with visual understanding in object detection and establishing a new benchmark for multimodal capabilities in this field.

2. Related Work

In this section, we first provide an overview of traditional object detection models and their attempts to model inter-object relationships to reduce false detections. Next, we introduce leading MLLMs, discussing their visual reasoning capabilities. Finally, we compare the strengths and limitations of traditional object detection models and MLLMs with our proposed VLA, highlighting how VLA integrates the strengths of both approaches to achieve more accurate and contextually grounded detection results.

2.1. Reasoning-Based Modeling in Object Detection

Reasoning-based modeling in object detection aims to model instance-level contextual relationships among objects to produce more coherent detection results.

Implicit modeling typically uses convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to learn contextual relationships between the visual features of proposed detections, embedding these relationships into proposal features. This approach helps reduce false detections, thus improving the performance of detection models. For instance, Spatial Memory Network (SMN) [3] reassembles object instances into a pseudo “image” to enable object-object context reasoning through a

secondary ConvNet. This structure supports parallel processing of image and memory, allowing detected objects to iteratively update memory. Similarly, Relation Networks [5] process sets of objects by modeling interactions between their appearance features and geometries, facilitating pairwise relational modeling.

Explicit modeling [14, 25, 29] often represents object proposals as nodes, with methods like Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs) [15] or Gated Recurrent Units (GRUs) [3, 32] extracting contextual relationships to improve detection results. Additionally, some methods project visual features of proposals onto pre-defined class text embeddings [30]. These approaches enhance visual representations by leveraging consistent relational graphs derived from text embeddings, thereby increasing the accuracy and robustness of object detection.

Both implicit and explicit modeling approaches primarily focus on relationships between local objects, often overlooking the broader contextual environment. While these methods embed context within proposal features, they do so in a secondary capacity, as localization and classification tasks remain separate. This separation weakens the role of context, leading to unreasonable detections. In contrast, our proposed VLA leverages MLLMs (acting as a Linguistic Agent) for global visual understanding and natural language reasoning, identifying errors in traditional object detection outputs (produced by the Visual Agent) and utilizing domain-specific Vision Agents to correct them. This approach capitalizes on the MLLM’s reasoning power while enabling the Vision Agents to refine detections, resulting in more accurate and contextually coherent outcomes.

2.2. AI Agents

The rapid development of MLLMs [4, 10, 11, 13, 21, 31] has led to new research on AI agents. AI agents aim to decompose complex problems into manageable sub-tasks, using Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [24] reasoning, where MLLMs serve as the central “brain” that issues commands to specialized models across various domains. For instance, HuggingGPT [19] leverages ChatGPT to coordinate multiple specialized AI models from Hugging Face [7] to produce detailed image captions that describe both visual content and underlying context. ViperGPT [20] utilizes code generation models to compose vision-and-language models into structured subroutines, enabling it to generate responses for diverse queries. Compositional Chain-of-Thought (CCoT) [16] combines large language models with scene graph models to create more accurate scene graphs and enhances the model’s ability to interpret complex visual scenes.

Unlike these AI agents, our VLA integrates the holistic visual understanding and natural language reasoning abilities of MLLMs to identify erroneous detections produced




Figure 2. Comparison of traditional object detection (a) and MLLM (b) approaches. Traditional object detection focuses on reasoning among local objects without global context, limiting its ability to model object relationships. In contrast, MLLMs incorporate both local and global context, enabling more comprehensive object relationship modeling.

by traditional object detection models. It then employs Classification Vision Agents to correct these errors, resulting in more coherent and contextually rational object detection outcomes. This approach not only makes traditional object detection more robust but also improves the MLLM’s ability to localize objects accurately within images.

3. Methodology

The Visual-Linguistic Agent (VLA) is an advanced system designed to enable seamless collaboration between a linguistic agent and specialized, domain-specific visual agents. Section 3.1 examines the limitations of traditional object detection methods, focusing on the causes of unreasonable detections and comparing these with MLLMs in terms of object relationship modeling. Section 3.2 provides an in-depth introduction to our VLA paradigm, illustrating how diverse visual and natural language agents work together to achieve more contextually coherent object detection.

3.1. Problem Statement

Traditional object detection models generate numerous independent region proposals based on local visual cues. These proposals are then processed by separate branches for position regression and category classification, predicting bounding boxes and categories independently. This approach neglects global contextual relationships, enforcing a direct mapping between local features and category priors without broader contextual coherence. This limitation is particularly evident when the Intersection over Union (IoU) between proposals is low, making it difficult to establish

meaningful connections and increasing the likelihood of inconsistent or implausible detections, as shown in Figure 2.

In scenarios where objects are spatially isolated, resulting in low IoU values among objects, the class probability distribution $P(y_i)$ for each object y_i tends to disperse, indicating higher uncertainty. This dispersion can increase false detections, particularly when contextual plausibility is compromised. The model’s reliance on local spatial relationships also affects the weighted entropy, $H_w(Y)$, defined as:

$$H_w(Y) = - \sum_{i=1}^n (P(y_i) \cdot w_i) \log P(y_i), \quad (1)$$

Here, we define $w_i = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j \neq i} \text{IoU}(B_i, B_j)}$, where B_i represents the bounding box of the i -th object, and w_i approximates 1 for objects with low IoU values, reflecting weak spatial connections and thereby increasing their contribution to $H_w(Y)$. Higher entropy reflects the model’s limited interpretative power, as it cannot establish relationships between objects beyond spatial proximity alone. This limitation often leads to unreasonable detections, where the model lacks the semantic context to discern whether objects logically belong together.

In contrast, MLLMs incorporate a “global view”, leveraging both visual and linguistic cues to establish coherent semantic relationships based on contextual knowledge. By drawing on large-scale pre-trained knowledge and common-sense reasoning, MLLMs can interpret scene relationships without relying solely on IoU, enabling them to filter out improbable relationships (e.g., “orange in the sky”) in favor of plausible, contextually relevant detections. This capacity for common-sense reasoning results in a more concentrated probability distribution $P(y_i, r_{ij})$, where r_{ij} represents the semantic relationship between objects y_i and y_j . The global entropy of the MLLM’s output, $H(Y, R)$, is therefore lower and calculated as:

$$H(Y, R) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} P(y_i, r_{ij}) \log P(y_i, r_{ij}), \quad (2)$$

where $P(y_i, r_{ij})$ represents the MLLM’s refined probability distribution, focused on contextually valid relationships. By concentrating probabilities on plausible combinations and suppressing unlikely predictions, the MLLM achieves a lower entropy $H(Y, R)$, indicating its enhanced capacity for modeling object relationships with reduced uncertainty. This context-aware filtering is particularly valuable in reducing false detections that would otherwise arise in traditional models.

The difference in entropy between the traditional model’s IoU-based entropy $H_w(Y)$ and the MLLM’s global

entropy $H(Y, R)$ can be quantified as the information gain (IG):

$$IG = H_w(Y) - H(Y, R). \quad (3)$$

A larger IG reflects the extent to which the MLLM reduces uncertainty by leveraging contextual reasoning. This improvement in object relationship modeling, facilitated by the MLLM’s global, context-based perspective, results in more rational and contextually relevant detections. By integrating the MLLM’s semantic reasoning with traditional object detectors, VLA bridges the gap between spatial precision and semantic coherence, enhancing both the accuracy and interpretability of object detection in complex visual scenes. This synergy produces results that more closely align with human intuition and practical scene understanding.

3.2. Visual-Linguistic Agent

As shown in Figure 3, the VLA framework enhances the effectiveness of traditional object detection models by harnessing the natural language reasoning and global scene understanding capabilities of MLLMs. This paradigm operates in three key stages: 1) global scene understanding and object detection, 2) rational analysis and error filtering using MLLMs, and 3) targeted error correction. The following sections detail the design of each phase.

3.2.1 Scene Understanding and Object Detection

In the first stage, **Scene Understanding and Object Detection**, VLA combines *scene comprehension* with *object detection* through the collaboration between the **Visual Agent** and the MLLM, acting as the **Linguistic Agent**.

The **Visual Agent** (e.g., YOLO) processes an input image to generate bounding boxes and class labels for detected objects. The output from the Visual Agent includes:

- **Input:** Image
- **Output:** Object detection results with bounding box coordinates and class labels, such as:
 - Airplane, coordinates: upper-left (320, 49), lower-right (640, 150)
 - Orange, coordinates: upper-left (100, 350), lower-right (190, 480)

Simultaneously, the **Linguistic Agent** (MLLM) generates a contextual **image caption** based on visual features to summarize the scene. For example, if the image shows an airplane flying in the sky with the moon visible, as illustrated in Figure 3, the caption might be:

“The image shows an airplane flying across the sky with the moon in the background”.




Figure 3. The proposed **Visual-Linguistic-Agent (VLA)** paradigm. The Visual Agent (e.g., YOLO) detects objects and generates bounding boxes with class labels, which are passed to the Linguistic Agent (MLLM) for reasoning and contextual analysis. Based on the MLLM’s assessment, false detections are filtered, and the Classification Visual Agent corrects erroneous detections. This collaboration between agents enhances object detection accuracy and provides more contextually coherent results.

The detection results from the **Visual Agent** are then converted into a text prompt and passed to the **Linguistic Agent** for further analysis. An example prompt might be:

“The object detector identified the following objects:

- Airplane, coordinates: (320, 49), (640, 150)
- Orange, coordinates: (100, 350), (190, 480)

Are these results reasonable based on the scene context?”

This prompt serves as the input for the **Linguistic Agent** in the next stage, establishing a seamless integration be-

tween the initial detection results and the rational analysis that follows.

3.2.2 Rational Analysis and Error Filtering

In this stage, the **Linguistic Agent** processes the prompt generated in the previous step, evaluating the reasonableness of each detection based on its understanding of the scene and common-sense knowledge. The MLLM compares the detected objects against the contextual information derived from the image caption and spatial relationships among objects.

For instance, if the detection results include an object classified as an “orange” with coordinates that match the position of the moon, the **Linguistic Agent** can infer that this classification is likely incorrect based on the scene context (as the moon would not logically be identified as an orange). The output of this stage is a refined set of detection results, where false detections are flagged for correction.

- **Input:** Text prompt with detection results from the Visual Agent.
- **Output:** Flagged results identifying false detections. For example:

“Airplane detection is reasonable. Orange detection is unreasonable, as the object is likely the moon”.

These flagged detection results are then passed as input to the next stage, where targeted error correction is performed.

3.2.3 Targeted Error Correction

In the final stage, **Targeted Error Correction**, the system addresses flagged detections identified by the **Linguistic Agent**. False detections are corrected by engaging a **Classification Visual Agent**, which performs fine-grained classification on the specified regions. As shown in Figure 3, the region where the “orange” was misclassified is sent to the classification model for correction, resulting in an updated label:

Region (100, 350), (190, 480): reclassified as “moon”.

This final step integrates corrections from the classification model with the capabilities of the detection model, ensuring the detection results are both accurate and contextually relevant. The collaboration between the **Linguistic Agent** and the **Visual Agents** optimizes the MLLM’s reasoning power while enhancing object detection accuracy, resulting in more coherent and rational detection outcomes.

4. Experiments

4.1. Experimental Settings

The Visual-Linguistic-Agent framework is evaluated using a range of MLLMs as the Linguistic Agent, including GPT-4o [8], Claude 3.5 Sonnet [8], LLaVA [8], and Gemini 1.5 [8]. Each model offers distinct strengths in scene understanding and contextual reasoning. For object detection, we employ Faster R-CNN [18], YOLOX [22], YOLOv11 [9], DETR [2], and DINO [26] as the Visual Agents to generate initial bounding boxes and class labels. Additionally, CLIP is used as a Classification Visual Agent to refine false detections and verify object classifications, leveraging its strong

Table 1. Performance (%) of different object detection models on the COCO dataset with and without VLA integration.

Model	AP _{50:95}	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _s	AP _m	AP _l
Faster R-CNN	37.4	58.1	40.4	21.2	41.0	48.1
Faster R-CNN+VLA	40.1	63.2	43.1	24.8	43.7	51.3
YOLOX	40.3	59.1	43.4	23.5	44.5	53.1
YOLOX+VLA	42.7	63.4	45.8	25.2	46.7	56.7
YOLO11	48.5	62.3	52.8	28.6	53.9	66.6
YOLO11+VLA	49.8	64.1	54.2	29.1	54.9	68.3
DETR	39.7	60.3	41.4	17.2	43.2	59.2
DETR+VLA	41.4	63.3	43.2	18.8	45.1	61.1
DINO	49.5	67.3	53.9	32.2	52.7	64.2
DINO+VLA	52.1	71.2	56.9	36.1	55.2	66.9

text-image alignment capabilities. The Linguistic and Visual Agents exchange information using JSON format for structured data transfer, with final results saved in COCO-style JSON files for performance evaluation.

Experiments are conducted on the COCO dataset, a comprehensive benchmark containing diverse object categories, sizes, and backgrounds, making it ideal for assessing detection and correction performance. Evaluation metrics include Detection Metrics such as mean Average Precision (mAP) [23], with AP_{50:95}, AP₅₀, AP₇₅, AP_s (small objects), AP_m (medium objects), and AP_l (large objects) as key indicators of detection performance across categories. Additionally, Correction Rate is introduced to assess the VLA framework’s accuracy in correcting unreasonable labels, focusing on false detections and classification accuracy. This setup provides a thorough analysis of each model configuration within the VLA paradigm, revealing insights into the strengths of different MLLM and object detection model combinations.

4.2. Quantitative Results

We evaluate the performance improvements achieved by integrating the proposed VLA framework with various object detection models on the COCO dataset. Table 1 presents the results across metrics. The integration of VLA consistently enhances performance across all models. For instance, Faster R-CNN’s AP_{50:95} improved from 37.4 to 40.1 with VLA, while YOLOX’s AP_{50:95} increased from 40.3 to 42.7. DINO, the highest-performing model, achieved an AP_{50:95} of 49.5, which further rose to 52.1 when integrated with VLA. These improvements highlight VLA’s ability to enhance detection accuracy by leveraging contextual reasoning, particularly in complex scenes and for small objects where object relationships are critical.

The results in Table 1 further demonstrate that VLA integration improves the detection of medium and large objects across models. By refining object detection outputs through context-aware analysis, VLA provides a notable increase in precision across a range of challenging scenarios. More-




Figure 4. Examples of error correction by VLA using DINO with MLLMs as the Linguistic Agent. The figure highlights common misclassifications corrected by VLA, such as identifying a dog instead of a horse, recognizing a kite instead of an umbrella, and correctly labeling a cow instead of a sheep. These corrections demonstrate VLA’s ability to refine object detection outputs by leveraging linguistic reasoning to resolve ambiguous or erroneous labels.

over, this paradigm effectively maximizes the MLLM’s reasoning capabilities, while domain-specific Vision Agents

carry out tasks delegated by the Linguistic Agent, resulting in more accurate and contextually coherent detections.

Table 2. Detection Performance (%) of DINO with and without VLA integration using different MLLMs as the Linguistic Agent.

Model	AP _{50:95}	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _s	AP _m	AP _l
DINO	49.5	67.3	53.9	32.2	52.7	64.2
DINO+VLA (Claude)	51.7	70.7	55.9	36.8	54.7	65.6
DINO+VLA (Gemini)	51.6	70.5	55.5	35.3	54.4	65.3
DINO+VLA (LLaVA)	51.9	71.1	56.7	36.2	55.0	67.1
DINO+VLA (GPT-4o)	52.1	71.2	56.9	36.1	55.2	66.9

4.3. Visual Reasoning Capabilities of MLLMs

Table 2 and Figure 4 present the performance of DINO with and without VLA integration, using various MLLMs as the Linguistic Agent. The results indicate that VLA integration consistently enhances DINO’s detection metrics, with significant improvements in AP_{50:95}, AP₅₀, and AP₇₅. Notably, DINO+VLA (GPT-4o) achieves the highest AP_{50:95} at 52.1, an improvement of 2.6 points over the baseline DINO model’s AP_{50:95} of 49.5. Similarly, DINO+VLA (LLaVA) increases AP_{50:95} by 2.4 points, reaching 51.9. GPT-4o also yields substantial gains in AP₅₀ (+3.9) and AP₇₅ (+3.0), showcasing its strong contextual reasoning capabilities that enhance detection accuracy, particularly for small and medium objects.

VLA integration also provides notable improvements in detecting smaller objects (AP_s), with all MLLM configurations showing gains. For example, DINO’s AP_s improves by 4.6 points with Claude, while LLaVA and GPT-4o also demonstrate significant boosts, underscoring VLA’s effectiveness in refining object detection for smaller, challenging objects. Overall, as shown in Figure 4, the choice of MLLM impacts VLA’s effectiveness. While all configurations yield performance enhancements, GPT-4o and LLaVA stand out, demonstrating superior contextual reasoning and refinement capabilities within the VLA framework.

4.4. Ablation Study

Effectiveness of VLA Components: Table 3 evaluates the error correction capabilities of the DINO model with and without the integration of the Linguistic Agent (LA) and VLA. Metrics include Error Detections (ED, total erroneous detections identified), Corrected Detections (CD, number of errors corrected by the framework), and Corrected Rate (CR, percentage of corrected errors). The baseline DINO model shows a Corrected Rate of 0%, indicating its inability to self-correct erroneous detections. With the integration of LA, the CR increases to 44.9%, highlighting that LA’s reasoning capabilities can partially assist in identifying and correcting errors. However, due to limited local context, LA alone is less effective in complex scenarios.

The DINO+VLA configuration achieves the highest improvement, with a Corrected Rate of up to 75.0%. This result emphasizes the advantage of combining the MLLM’s

Table 3. Error correction capabilities of DINO with and without the integration of LA and VLA. ED represents the number of label prediction errors in bounding boxes generated by DINO.

Model	ED	CD	CR
DINO	1327	0	0%
DINO+LA (GPT-4o)	1327	597	44.9%
DINO+VLA (Claude)	1327	982	74.0%
DINO+VLA (Gemini)	1327	979	73.7%
DINO+VLA (LLaVA)	1327	990	74.6%
DINO+VLA (GPT-4o)	1327	996	75.0%

Table 4. AP performance (%) of the DINO model with and without integration of LA and VLA.

Model	AP _{50:95}	AP ₅₀	AP ₇₅	AP _s	AP _m	AP _l
DINO	49.5	67.3	53.9	32.2	52.7	64.2
DINO+LA	51.6	69.8	52.3	35.2	54.2	65.0
DINO+VLA	52.1	71.2	56.9	36.1	55.2	66.9

global reasoning with the Classification Visual Agent’s local object understanding. By integrating VLA, the framework not only filters out unreasonable detections but also enhances the MLLM’s ability to process local visual information, enabling more comprehensive error correction. Table 4 further illustrates detection performance, with DINO+VLA achieving the best results across all AP metrics, particularly AP_{50:95} and AP₇₅, demonstrating how VLA enhances detection accuracy by combining global context reasoning with precise local object recognition.

In conclusion, while LA integration improves the DINO model’s error correction capability through global contextual reasoning, it lacks the precision required for local object detection. The VLA framework effectively merges the MLLM’s global reasoning capabilities with enhanced local visual understanding, achieving the highest correction rates and detection performance. This underscores the importance of combining linguistic and visual agents to achieve reliable and contextually coherent object detection.

5. Conclusion

We presented the **Visual-Linguistic-Agent (VLA)**, a novel paradigm designed to enhance traditional object detection models by leveraging the reasoning and relational capabilities of multimodal large language models (MLLMs). Within the VLA framework, the MLLM serves as a Linguistic Agent that collaborates with both an object detection Vision Agent and a classification Vision Agent. This setup enables the MLLM to generate contextual captions, assess detection outputs, and make informed corrections, integrating its global reasoning capabilities with the precise local-

ization strengths of the Vision Agents. Consequently, VLA achieves detection outcomes that are not only more accurate but also more contextually coherent. Experimental results on the COCO dataset demonstrate that VLA effectively reduces unreasonable detections by incorporating contextual understanding.

Limitations: While VLA is effective in addressing clear labeling errors and enhancing contextual coherence, certain complex detection issues remain challenging. For instance, handling redundant bounding boxes on a single object, which may occasionally bypass non-maximum suppression, requires further exploration. Addressing these nuanced cases could provide additional refinements to VLA's performance in future work.

References

- [1] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2015. 2
- [2] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 213–229. Springer, 2020. 2, 6
- [3] Xinlei Chen and Abhinav Gupta. Spatial memory for context reasoning in object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4086–4096, 2017. 2, 3
- [4] Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi SM Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, et al. Palme: An embodied multimodal language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03378*, 2023. 2, 3
- [5] Han Hu, Jiayuan Gu, Zheng Zhang, Jifeng Dai, and Yichen Wei. Relation networks for object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3588–3597, 2018. 3
- [6] Zhengdong Hu, Yifan Sun, Jingdong Wang, and Yi Yang. Dac-detr: Divide the attention layers and conquer. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2
- [7] Shashank Mohan Jain. Hugging face. In *Introduction to transformers for NLP: With the hugging face library and models to solve problems*, pages 51–67. Springer, 2022. 3
- [8] Darioush Kevian, Usman Syed, Xingang Guo, Aaron Havens, Geir Dullerud, Peter Seiler, Lianhui Qin, and Bin Hu. Capabilities of large language models in control engineering: A benchmark study on gpt-4, claude 3 opus, and gemini 1.0 ultra. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03647*, 2024. 6
- [9] Rahima Khanam and Muhammad Hussain. Yolov11: An overview of the key architectural enhancements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17725*, 2024. 6
- [10] Bohao Li, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, Guangzhi Wang, Rui Wang, Ruimao Zhang, and Ying Shan. Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13299–13308, 2024. 2, 3
- [11] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. *ICML*, 2023. 2, 3
- [12] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. 2
- [13] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08485*, 2023. 2, 3
- [14] Yabo Liu, Jinghua Wang, Chao Huang, Yaowei Wang, and Yong Xu. Cigar: Cross-modality graph reasoning for domain adaptive object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 23776–23786, 2023. 2, 3
- [15] Yutian Liu, Soora Rasouli, Melvin Wong, Tao Feng, and Tianjin Huang. Rt-gcn: Gaussian-based spatiotemporal graph convolutional network for robust traffic prediction. *Information Fusion*, 102:102078, 2024. 2, 3
- [16] Chancharik Mitra, Brandon Huang, Trevor Darrell, and Roei Herzig. Compositional chain-of-thought prompting for large multimodal models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14420–14431, 2024. 3
- [17] Thao Nguyen, Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Gabriel Ilharco, Se-woong Oh, and Ludwig Schmidt. Improving multimodal datasets with image captioning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2
- [18] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 39(6):1137–1149, 2016. 6
- [19] Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. Hugginggpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in hugging face. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 3
- [20] Dídac Surís, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. Vipergpt: Visual inference via python execution for reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11888–11898, 2023. 3
- [21] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. 2, 3
- [22] Chi-Yi Tsai, Run-Yu Wang, and Yu-Chen Chiu. Sw-yolox: A yolox-based real-time pedestrian detector with shift window-mixed attention mechanism. *Neurocomputing*, 606:128357, 2024. 6
- [23] Hao Vo, Sieu Tran, Duc Minh Nguyen, Thua Nguyen, Tien Do, Duy-Dinh Le, and Thanh Duc Ngo. Robust motorcycle helmet detection in real-world scenarios: Using co-detr and minority class enhancement. In *Proceedings of*

the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 7163–7171, 2024. 6

- [24] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022. 3
- [25] Hang Xu, Chenhan Jiang, Xiaodan Liang, and Zhenguo Li. Spatial-aware graph relation network for large-scale object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9298–9307, 2019. 2, 3
- [26] Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Shilong Liu, Lei Zhang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, Lionel Ni, and Heung-Yeung Shum. Dino: Detr with improved denoising anchor boxes for end-to-end object detection. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. 6
- [27] Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Shilong Liu, Lei Zhang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, Lionel M Ni, and Heung-Yeung Shum. Dino: Detr with improved denoising anchor boxes for end-to-end object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03605*, 2022. 2
- [28] Chuyang Zhao, Yifan Sun, Wenhao Wang, Qiang Chen, Er-rui Ding, Yi Yang, and Jingdong Wang. Ms-detr: Efficient detr training with mixed supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 17027–17036, 2024. 2
- [29] Jianjun Zhao, Jun Chu, Lu Leng, Chaolin Pan, and Tao Jia. Rgrn: Relation-aware graph reasoning network for object detection. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 35(22):16671–16688, 2023. 2, 3
- [30] Chenchen Zhu, Fangyi Chen, Uzair Ahmed, Zhiqiang Shen, and Marios Savvides. Semantic relation reasoning for shot-stable few-shot object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8782–8791, 2021. 3
- [31] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. 2, 3
- [32] Muhammad Zulqarnain, Rozaida Ghazali, Muhammad Aamir, and Yana Mazwin Mohamad Hassim. An efficient two-state gru based on feature attention mechanism for sentiment analysis. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 83(1): 3085–3110, 2024. 2, 3